

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. Since when is a politically biased defamation campaign against one candidate in the interest of the public at large? And since when is a 33 year old story about one candidate NEWS and other similarly-aged stories about another candidate NONE OF MY BUSINESS? Shouldn't the public have some say in these matters? I think so.

I don't object to Free Speech in this country, not in the least little bit. However I do object to other aspects of the intent of this broadcast - primarily, this is simply NOT NEWS as it is being called. This is most clearly a political statement timed to influence the presidential election, and if nothing else this broadcasting family that owns Sinclair should register as a "527" like Swift Boat Veterans for truth. Then the President can deny all involvement with them, then the motives for this broadcast will be crystal-clear.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.